Application No.: 09/868,665 Docket No.: 20234-00072-US

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Entry of new claims 7-11 is requested in order to more completely claim the subject matter of the present application.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Doone (U.S. Pat. No. 5,218,508) in view of Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473) is requested. The present invention as exemplified by claim 1, and more particularly described in new claims 7-11, requires that there be a series connection of surge arresters which are connected in parallel. The surge arresters are interconnected using a mounting bracket having multiple limbs. The surge protector includes a corona suppression means at the end of each limb.

While Doone (U.S. Pat. No. 5,218,508) describes electrical surge arresters in parallel, and then in series, it fails to disclose the aforesaid features of a multiple limb bracket interconnecting the parallel connected arresters. Further, the particular corona suppression means at the end of the series combination of arresters which is in the form of a corona suppression ring per claims 2, 10 and 11, is not disclosed in Doone (U.S. Pat. No. 5,218,508).

Turning now to the secondary reference to Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473), a different type of surge arrester assembly is disclosed. According to Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473), a folded parallel arrangement is described wherein bars 4A and 4B are electrically connected, and the other terminal of the devices is the conductor 41. Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473) therefore does not, as alleged in the Office Action, disclose with respect to Fig. 9, a series/parallel structure as required in the present invention, and which was disclosed in Doone (U.S. Pat. No. 5,218,508).

Application No.: 09/868,665 Docket No.: 20234-00072-US

It is therefore clear that the combination of Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473) and Doone (U.S. Pat. No. 5,218,508) is inappropriate, in that they deal with two different types of arrester diverter circuits. Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473) fails to disclose the series combination of parallel connected arrester structures. Col. 4 of the Lundquist et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,317,473) reference describes the subject matter of Figs. 9-11 as comprising 20 parallel connected arrester unit 1, which are arranged pair wise in groups. The entire connection as described in col. 4, lines 1-26, appears to be parallel in nature. Thus, the final rejection proposes combining a reference which shows only parallel connected devices, to another reference comprising parallel arresters, which in turn are serially connected, in order to reject the present application. The combination of such diverse structures is the impermissible result of hindsight rather than any suggestion contained in the art.

Additionally, the rejected claims calls for multiple limb mounting bracket structures. As set forth in rejected claim 1, and new claims 8-10, the multi limb structure is used to connect a plurality of arrester stages in series. Further, that portion of Applicants claims calling for a corona suppression ring at the top of the structure (per claims 2, 9 and 10) is not suggested in either reference.

In view of the foregoing wherein it has been shown that the combination of references is the result of an impermissible use of hindsight, and in light of the fact that even when combined, the references fail to disclose numerous limitations contained in Applicants claim, favorable reconsideration is believed to be in order.

Dated: October 30, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

George R. Pettit, Reg. No. 27,369
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP
1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
(202) 331-7111
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)